



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

REMARKS
ON A
LETTER
FROM THE
HOLLIS STREET SOCIETY
TO THEIR
UNITARIAN BRETHREN,
WITH THE
DOCUMENTS RELATING TO A RECENT CALL OF A MINISTER,
BY THAT SOCIETY.

BOSTON:
1846.
EASTBURN'S PRESS.

REMARKS
ON A
LETTER
FROM THE
HOLLIS STREET SOCIETY
TO THEIR
UNITARIAN BRETHREN,
WITH THE
DOCUMENTS RELATING TO A RECENT CALL OF A MINISTER,
BY THAT SOCIETY.

BOSTON:
1846.
EASTBURN'S PRESS.

BX
9869
• F¹⁶
BYE

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

GENERAL LIBRARY

ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN

1.22.13

REMARKS.

A pamphlet in relation to the affairs of the religious society of the Hollis Street Meeting House, has just issued from the press, and is published, we are told on the title page, according to a vote of the society. However extraordinary and unwarrantable the whole matter of this pamphlet may appear to the uninitiated, it forms we think, a very appropriate *finale* to the acts and doings which for the last nine years have characterised the course of the present majority of the Hollis Street Society. The Letter which serves as a preface to the document, and which is addressed "to Christian brethren of the Unitarian denomination," may justly be considered as quite a curiosity, in its way. It abounds to absolute redundancy, with the catch phraseology, and pharasaical show of an assumed religious fervor and piety, that presents a strange contrast with its fliprant tone of remark, its assumed authority, its utter unfairness, and the bold and unblushing assertions, with which the whole thing is literally crowded. Its very title utters a falsehood, and the whole letter is, in this respect, in perfect harmony and keeping with the title.

It purports, on its title page, to be "a Letter from the Hollis Street Society to their Christian brethren of the Unitarian denomination," whereas it has never been before the proprietors, its publication has never been authorized by any act of the society whatever; and that the intention of publishing it, and even its existence, was wholly unknown, we have no doubt, except perhaps to four or five members of the society. It claims, to be sure, very fully and frequently, to be the mouthpiece of the society, and is, we admit, a fit exponent of the spirit, principles and views that have been exhibited, from time to time, by the present majority; though, in the peculiarities displayed by them in the Hollis Street controversy, it out Herods them all. Its very signature, "the Proprietors of the Meeting House, in Hollis Street," is unique and significant. It was written, we have abundant reason to believe, by a member of the legal profession, recently uniting with, or more properly speaking attached to, the society, by a simple and common practice in the society. Persons are wanted to represent pews at the ballot-box of the society, and forthwith, the association who bought up the pews to control the society, deed a pew to the individual for that purpose only, and thus these straw members of the society serve the purpose of actual members, and make as good a show on paper, as so many true men. The individual, however, who wrote the letter, was doubtless needed for a two-fold purpose. He could, it was probably thought, conduct the case of the majority, as well as cast the vote they might direct him, and manage the diplomatic department, in which there was an urgent necessity for assistance.

The letter of this acute diplomatist opens in a truly lachrymose vein, and begins by setting forth in moving

terms the “tribulations and afflictions” encountered by the society in times past, by reason of divisions; and enlarges upon the “sufferings” they have endured in consequence of the “sufferings of their brethren of other societies who could not fail to sympathize with them in their sorrows,” and because this “unhappy state of things would bring reproach upon the christian name and profession.” The acuteness of these compound sufferings is so sublimated and raised above the apprehensions of common sense, that we cannot comprehend their nature and force with any degree of certainty. On the contrary it quite confounds the common notions of such matters; for they suppose, the sympathy of others, with those under afflictions, to have a soothing and comforting influence. But it is quite otherwise, it seems, with the Hollis Street sufferers. The perverse course of things runs counter there, it seems, to ‘nature’s law,’ and suffering and sympathy produce one another, and thus go on until the amount of misery heaped up between threatens to outlive time, and force us to cry out “our sufferings are intolerable.” But nevertheless the sudden change that soon breaks forth should teach us never to despair. We are next told, “a brighter day has dawned;” and this promise of a brilliant meridian and joyful escape from clouds and storms whose shadows have heretofore overcast our days and whose “pitiless peltings” we have so long endured, this, has rendered us so abundantly charitable towards our naughty opponents, and we are so filled with joy at the happy event, that we are extremely earnest and sincerely desirous “to forget and forgive” and dwell together again in harmony. Unfortunately however, this blessed self-complacency and forgiving spirit, this christian determination, is of very brief dura-

tion, and only lasts to permit, with studied grandiloquence, the "announcement of the unfeigned joy" they experience at the wonderful blessing at last vouchsafed to their prayers, by obtaining the services of the Rev. David Fosdick, to minister unto them in holy things, and who only awaits the "ceremonies of installation," to enter upon labors, the brilliant fruition of which, will undoubtedly consign past "sufferings" to "blank oblivion" and forgetfulness.

But alas, for the frailty of human resolves and the weakness of the human purpose. The echo had hardly ceased of their vaunting disposition, not to enquire who has been to blame for the evils which had befallen, and of their "sincere desire to forgive and forget," ere they turn sharply round upon the minority, and arraign them for presuming to dissent from the wishes of the majority in the settlement of a minister, and rebuke them, in no measured terms, for uttering their reasons for so doing, notwithstanding those reasons are in perfect unison with the grounds the minority have always maintained, and are in substance the same that have actuated them from the commencement of the controversy to the present time.

We are then treated to a critique of the protests of the minority, which, we are gravely told, "assume that the majority have been so sinful in practice, and are still so base and corrupt at heart and purpose, that they have forfeited all right to christian rights and ordinances." The protests are published in the pamphlet with this letter, and can therefore be easily referred to. That they assume no such thing, will appear very evident on the slightest examination.

Their assumption, which is abundantly supported by the facts, in the case, is simply this—that the past acts,

principles and opinions of the majority, render it sufficiently obvious that their purpose, in settling a minister, is to obtain a clerical advocate to *excuse* those principles and opinions, to prostitute the ordinances of religion to the interests of rum selling and slaveholding, and give christian standing and respectability to individuals in such vocations. And the minority assume, very legitimately, from these premises, that any minister, who may take service with the majority, for these purposes, must be a poor timeserver and clerical trimmer, without the least claim to the christian name and character ; and whether “this is a pretty *large conclusion* from the premises,” we have no hesitation in saying it is a conclusion forced upon us by the facts and circumstances of the case. We might here, we think, with great propriety, appeal to our “christian brethren of the Unitarian denomination,” to decide whether, according to their idea of christian morals, it is right, morally and religiously considered, for an individual in any community to engage in practices or follow vocations for pecuniary gain, that cause serious evil, moral and physical, to many around them, and benefit none ? and whether rum selling and slaveholding are not necessarily embraced in the category of such practices and vocations ?

But, there is another assumption imputed to the protests, and as it is the only instance throughout the whole letter, in which we are fairly quoted, and our plain meaning correctly represented, we desire to note this solitary exception to the general rule. The assumption is simply this :—“ That the majority in the Hollis Street Society have been, and now are, opposed to temperance” and “emancipation,” and issue is boldly taken on these declarations of the minority.

Now with reference to these points, it has always been admitted that they lie at the foundation of the difficulties in the Hollis Street Society, and are the subjects upon which difference of opinion has arisen, and thereby caused the controversy—when, therefore, the writer denies the principles and acts of his employers, we refer him, for he is but a recent member, of small experience in this business, to the sayings and doings of the majority, as chronicled in the records of the Society during the two first years of the controversy. He will there find, the then minority and now majority, did declare “a wide difference of opinion” existed between themselves and the pastor on certain “exciting topics,” and the “expediency of discussing” them, and that for these reasons the “connexion between him and the Society ought to be dissolved.” We allude to the votes passed September, 1838, and September, 1839, and to the famous report, of October 14, 1839, which charges him with “entering into the exciting topics of temperance and abolition.” The records and documents of 1838 and 1839, the declarations of his opponents, and every movement and influence connected with this matter, will show a mass of evidence with regard to the position of the majority and their hostility to temperance and emancipation, that he himself, in a legal capacity, would consider overwhelming proof of the “assumptions” we have made, and a withering rebuke of his own assertion to the contrary.

But, not content with denying the fact that the majority have been always opposed to temperance and emancipation, he even goes on to tax credulity and wonder to the utmost possible extent, and absolutely and roundly asserts, that the “majority ever have been and still are FRIENDS AND ADVOCATES of temperance

and the OPPONENTS and ENEMIES OF SLAVERY.” These assertions certainly cap the climax. The force of assurance, in the face of fact, “can no further go.” A declaration that Lucifer is an angel of light and Benedict Arnold a patriot, would not be more preposterous. Have the majority in the Hollis Street Society rendered any aid or countenance, by word or deed, by sympathy or consanguinity, in any way, or by any means, in the cause of temperance? Have they exercised any influence to turn the steps of the drunkard from the path of perdition that leads through the grog shop, or by precept or example, striven to show him the safety and necessity of total abstinence? May not the same questions with the same pertinency, be put with regard to the assumption that “they are opposers of slavery and friends of emancipation?” undoubtedly they can. How, then, most sapient advocate, learned in the lore, “to make the worse appear the better reason,” how can it be shown that the majority “are now, and ever have been, friends of temperance and emancipation.” Have you any other reason to offer us than your unqualified assertion? Ask your clients in this case. Appeal to them individually, from Moses Williams down to Henry Atkins, and our word for it, for they are honest, though erring on this question of temperance, they will tell you, your declaration is a libel on them. Ask the author of the famous report before referred to which declares Mr. Pierpont’s heresy on the “abolition of slavery,” a question he says, which “threatens the destruction of our glorious union,” and we feel sure that he and those who are in unison with him on that question, will say, you have misrepresented them, in claiming that he and they are “enemies of slavery and friends of emancipation.” Is it not notorious, on the

contrary, that the majority in the Hollis Street Society have always been bitterly hostile to all action in favor of temperance, and refused to entertain any thought on emancipation? Have they not on the contrary, like the dog in the manger only snarled at those who were disposed to do what they could in testifying against slavery, and advocating emancipation? And is it not equally notorious that for advocating in this community (not in Hollis Street pulpit) the temperance cause, with great zeal and efficiency, and declaring his unqualified detestation of slavery, and the duty of emancipation, on one occasion only in his pulpit, and with scarcely more words than we have used to describe his declarations, is it not true, we ask, that these gave offence to the majority;—and that they proceeded to expel him from the pulpit upon his declining at their urgent solicitations to hold his peace on these questions? We answer, that on all the points the evidence that establishes the truth of our assumptions is overwhelming; and that there is nothing to place against this evidence but the simple affirmation of, “not guilty.”

We do not feel called upon to notice particularly the paragraph, relating to the position and action of the late pastor, in this controversy; but will merely remark that from beginning to end it is a studied misrepresentation, and as was justly remarked of another document in this controversy, “it is worthy the paternity of a college of Jesuits. Higher praise in the diplomatic line, it were hard to win.”

The next subject which the document we are considering goes into, is an analysis of the votes cast on the question of settling Mr. Fosdick, and upon the signers of the protests. We do not consider this matter of any importance, nor do we admit the correctness

of this analysis. But if the writer attaches any importance to it, we submit, whether it is not necessary to analize the votes of the majority as well as the minority, and show the character of both, if the actual and relative strength of the parties is desirable to be known. And on this point, doubtless the writer possessed more accurate information, had he chosen to use it, than in regard to the votes of the minority. But this would be to elicit evidence not at all favorable to the cause of his clients, and was therefore declined.

It were easy to show, we think, that of the fifty-six votes cast in the affirmative, half at least were cast by individuals who never have attended, nor expect to attend, the Hollis Street Church ; but who hold the title deeds of pews, owned by the majority, and cast such votes as the majority put into their hands, mere men of straw, in this relation, friends of the majority, lugged in, to make a respectable show of numbers, and cast a legal vote, whenever the majority wish to displace, or settle, a minister. Of the other half many have not, for years, attended, nor do they now expect ever again to attend the Hollis Street Church ; so that the actual parties, on both sides, are reduced to lean ranks ; but whether the one or the other numbers most, has no bearing whatever on the question. We are next treated to a solution of motives of the minority for the extraordinary measures resorted to by them to prevent the settlement of a minister. And what, gentle reader, do you imagine was the cause of the perverseness of the minority discovered and brought triumphantly to light by this sagacious mouser in men's affairs and motives ; why, he has discovered that most of the minority in broad daylight, between the hours of ten and twelve of the clock of Sunday, attend the *discourses* of Mr. T.

Parker; and “more, o’ terrible and awfu’” that they absolutely “desired the meeting house in Hollis Street for the accommodation of that *gentleman’s followers*. And now that the “murder is out,” he exclaims, in holy horror and moral indignation, “the unexampled course of those opposing the settlement of Mr. Peabody and of Mr. Fosdick, is *at once explained*.” Pray be calm, dear religious public, this is no gunpowder plot, after all, if we will only look at it in the light of reason and philosophy. It is only the peculiar way our quondam friends, the majority, have of magnifying matters and things, and the startling manner of their present mouthpiece that presents these circumstances with such astounding emphasis. The simple truth, after all seems to be, by their own showing, that the minority preferred one man to settle in Hollis street, and the majority another, and that each party voted and acted in conformity with their several preferences.

But, says the writer, “the invariable course has been for a minority to withdraw, and make way for others,” and not to “maintain a pertinacious opposition when the majority has acted decidedly.” If the folly that pretends to set up this doctrine, as the standard of duty, for the government of minorities, could be practically subjected to its own creed, whenever it strayed into the company of men of sense and honesty, there would certainly be strong temptations to adopt it as a rule, notwithstanding the absurdity it involves, and the tyranny of the principle. The majority however could have told him, that they had established, for themselves at least, the opposite principle. For the two first years of this controversy, they were in a minority as the votes of the Society show; and so far from retiring to “seek other accommodation” and leave the majority at peace,

they put forth more obstinate exertions to displace the late pastor ; an object which they finally accomplished by the purchase of pews, and other less exceptional means.

Omitting much in this pamphlet that we have neither the patience, taste nor time, to lay open, we come now to the paragraph which treats of "anonymous letters addressed to Mr. Peabody and Mr. Fosdick." Why the Committee should feel themselves at liberty to withhold documents that the Society directed them to publish, or what the character of those letters is, the author of which is so piously left to his conscience and "that fearful looking for of a judgment to come," we, of course, cannot imagine. But the connection in which they are used must lead, we think, to the conclusion, that the intention of thus using them was, to create a suspicion that they were written by the minority. If they had no bearing on the matter in hand, or on the questions at issue between the majority and minority, for what purpose were they referred to, in connection with a critique on the course the minority pursued towards the reverend gentlemen who were the recipients of these anonymous letters, pronounced scandalous and indictable ? and why were they withheld in violation of the vote of the society from publication, and the minority thus deprived of the only means they could have, of tracing their authorship and relieving themselves from a foul suspicion thus sought to be attached to them. The reasons assigned for this course are not valid. If there was any *real desire* to show mercy, forbearance and pity to one party, this was not to be done by treating other parties with gross injustice, but by omitting to notice these letters at all.

If there is any one part of this extraordinary letter

that we have felt more repugnance and disgust in commenting upon than another it is this base and unmanly paragraph. We have now, and we desire to be thankful, got through this farrago of folly and malice, gravely denominated a letter from the Hollis Street Society to their Unitarian brethren. We trust, although the half is not touched upon, that we have shown enough of its shallow affectation, its hypocritical use and appliance of religious phraseology, its total want of all fairness, its Jesuitical course of review and remark, its misstatement and distortion of some facts, and the falsity of others, put forth as true, to cause pity in all truly religious minds, and disgust in every manly breast.

We would caution the writer, when he again appeals to the public, to be more careful than he has been in this instance, of claiming an authority and using a signature, to neither of which he had any honest title—and we warn him to adopt a totally different manner and spirit, from that here exhibited, for were his cause as straight as an arrow and his purpose pure, the method and way in which he advocates them, must necessarily cast strong suspicion on both. A course, which for aught we know, may avail a criminal to escape sentence in the Municipal Court, is not the proper one to adopt on moral and religious matters.

Who the writer is, that has thus taken Swiss service with the majority we cannot positively say. Nevertheless we feel justified, upon sufficient evidence, in imputing the authorship of this letter to Henry H. Fuller, Esq., who has recently become a member of the Hollis Street Society by a process, and for a purpose, (we presume) both of which we have before explained.

Doubtless the majority have long felt the need of a cunning advocate and special pleader to manage their

diplomatic affairs ; and, as it would appear less invidious, and sound better to have him a member, than simply to employ him in the usual way, they have inducted him into their body corporate. No doubt it may be justly considered, that both law and gospel, would prove serviceable in carrying forward the very *spiritual* warfare against intemperance and slavery, to which their advocate and mouthpiece, has, we think, rather hastily pledged them, without knowledge or consent on their part.

That this gentleman, just hitched on to the Hollis Street Society, should exercise so little discretion, and indulged himself in so much unfair and ungentlemanly remark, in relation to two of the signers of the protests, one of whom is now a communicant in Hollis Street Church, and both of whom have been regular worshippers there from childhood, we think may tend to show what straws are laid hold of, and what means unhesitatingly adopted, to obtain a worse end.

Of the letter to Mr. Peabody which bears indubitable marks of being penned by the same hand that wrote the letter we have been remarking upon, and the reply of that gentleman, we do not propose to say any thing, though there are some circumstances, connected with the negotiation that provoke remark and call for explanation, which we hope at some future time to see cleared up.

Mr. Fosdick who has accepted the call, and whose letter is published in this pamphlet, moved probably by some notion of even handed justice, has bestowed one portion of his reply on the majority, and given to the minority the other portion, which may be taken, we presume, as a reply to the protest, and we must therefore

pay our respects to that gentleman as briefly as we may, and now address the Rev. David Fosdick.

SIR,—In your reply to the Committee of the Hollis Street Society accepting the call of the Society to settle as their pastor, you affirm, that it is your steadfast determination “to keep as utterly as possible aloof from your present dissensions,” that you “do not wish to be the exponent of any party among them whether majority or minority,” and you sum up your protestations on this head with the cant phrase, proper enough, perhaps, in the mouth of a Calvinistic sectarian, but without pertinency in that of a Unitarian, “I would know nothing among you, save Christ and him crucified.”

Had you adhered to the course thus marked out by yourself in the very letter which put forth these obvious and proper determinations, and had you forborne a course of remark that at once fully identifies you with one of the parties, and subjects the other to a most unfair and forced criticism, you would have shown at least some regard to consistency and common prudence, and rendered any further notice on the part of the minority quite unnecessary. But, in the face of your own declaration of neutrality, you take service with the majority and volunteer to carry the war into the ranks of the minority; you openly join one of the belligerent parties, and arraign the other at the bar of your criticism, with a zeal that betrays your ardor in the cause of your new allies, and a logic that must surprise even veterans of the church militant.

In reviewing the reasons of the minority for opposing your settlement, you remark, “I could not but consider it a marked instance of inconsistency that they, (the minority) who in former days had so strenuously upheld what they termed the independence of the pulpit,

and complained of the majority of your body as infringing that independence, by unwillingness to listen to teachings incompatible with their opinions, should now oppose the settlement of a minister, who perhaps, would give independent utterance to opinions not precisely in unison with their own." Passing over other errors involved in the above passage, we will consider the principal one, which charges us with "marked inconsistency," as now infringing upon the independence of the pulpit, that we have heretofore labored to sustain in christian freedom.

We confess ourselves unable to find, in our letter to you, any evidence whatever to sustain this suspicion of yours, that we oppose your settlement from the fear that you may utter any independent sentiments whatever, either opposed to our own opinions, or in unison with them. We entertain no such fear on the one hand, nor on the other do we indulge the least hope. On the contrary, we endeavored to warn you that in accepting the call of the majority, "no one imbued with the spirit of Christ, or possessing a tithe of manly character or moral courage, could consent to place himself in a position so utterly dependent and servile, as the majority, judging of their known views and past acts, were very certain to subject you to. Silence, and not independent utterance of opinions on "exciting topics," is, as you very well know, the established principle, and required rule of the majority, who now control the pulpit, that you are so eager to occupy, that you decline as you have kindly told us, "unanimous and surprisingly affectionate solicitations to other pulpits, wholly unobjectionable," except perhaps, on the ground of the much smaller salary attached to *them*. This, however cannot be supposed to have weight with

one, who is so moved with christian fervor, with the love of "Christ and him crucified," that no higher object is presented to his view, than the forlorn "breach" in the Hollis Street Society, which like a brave soldier of the cross, he is determined to mount.

It is matter of the most common notoriety, and you profess to be "not unaware" of the fact, that the division in the Hollis Street Society was caused by differences of opinion, or at least of action, on questions purely moral, which, by the majority, were termed "exciting topics:" the late pastor and the present minority being actively friendly to the temperance reformation and the anti-slavery movement, and the present majority bitterly hostile to both. When, therefore, you charge the minority with opposing your settlement, on the supposition that you would give independent utterance to sentiments not in unison with their own, we must understand you as referring to temperance and slavery; and that it is your intention to oppose the temperance and anti-slavery movements, and in your pulpit ministrations, your social and civic relations, to advocate the superiority, moral and religious, of slavery as compared with freedom, and the blessings which the free trade in alcohol, in all its forms, bestows on a community, over the advantages to be derived from total abstinence.

Permit us to say that you are entirely mistaken, when you gratuitously infer that our opposition to your settlement had its foundation in the belief that you would do this, or that we should object to the independent utterance of sentiments not only "not precisely in unison with," but even diametrically opposed to our own. On the contrary, our fear is, not that you will give explicit utterance to the principles which the present ma-

jority have labored to establish as the Hollis Street code ; for you and they very well know, that by the open promulgation and advocacy of those principles, they will meet with the stern and general condemnation they so deservedly merit : but that you will not be permitted by the majority, or countenanced by your more wary and prudent brethren of the Unitarian ministry, to do this, even if you have honestly so resolved. We feel, therefore, that the charge of inconsistency will not rightly apply to us, in this matter, but may eventually attach to yourself, unless (which is not to be expected) you should be moved by a “ perverse imprudence ” to rebel against the necessities and conditions of your position, and to follow the independent course you have thus intimated.

No, sir, it is not the free and full utterance of sentiments “ not precisely in unison with our own ” that prevents our uniting with the majority, in the settlement of a minister ; but it is that hard condition, that we conceive to be now imposed on minister and pulpit in Hollis Street—the condition, namely, that no discussion can be permitted the minister, in or out of the pulpit, on subjects of deep moral importance, which are supposed to lead to results adverse to the pecuniary interests of the wealthy, and the discussion of which tends to interrupt the popular quiet and repose on religious and moral subjects. It is the cautious silence rigidly enforced on most, if not all the clergy, in the pulpits and in the community of this city, that we fear ; the dread of the light which the interchange of free thought pours on practices and principles, that flourish only in darkness ;—it is the establishment of this debasing principle, and the exercise of this tyrannic power, that we have striven against in the Hollis Street

Society, that we dread. It is in this connexion, and with these views, that we have opposed the settlement of a minister, and endeavored, though in vain, to warn you, sir, against accepting a place and occupying a position so repugnant to the free heart and manly spirit, which must both be bartered for pecuniary considerations and popular standing—popularity how dearly bought—wages how degradingly earned!

But you have made your election. We doubt not, you will stand in Hollis Street pulpit and proclaim in your loudest tones, that you are perfectly free to give independent utterance to your honest convictions on all moral questions, be the consequences to yourself what they may. You will profess too, to be friendly to the cause of temperance and opposed to slavery, for so much at least, will receive popular assent, and so long as you confine yourself to these abstract declarations, you will not ruffle the calm serenity of the lowest grog shop keeper, nor disturb in the least, the conscience or temper of the wholesale trafficker in human flesh, that accumulates wealth in the slave shambles of our country. But you will, we think be especially careful to *say* nothing, and *do* nothing, that will disturb either the one or the other in their wretched vocations, or “trouble them, before their time.” Nay more, when either claims from you the right hand of christian fellowship, and a certified acknowledgement of good christian character and standing, see to it, that these, their claims are promptly allowed by you; for this is the standard of ministerial duties, that nine years of exciting controversy, have at length reared, aided, by the coöperation of your clerical brethren of this city, over the Hollis Street pulpit. Principles and practices of a most pernicious character and ten-

dency thus successfully claim the mantle of the church to cover their abominations, and the influences of religion, or what passes for such, are thus prostituted to give respectability and support to popular errors, more dangerous, because less palpable and of wider application, than actual crime that comes under the cognizance of penal statutes.

This is the policy which seems to be adopted, or at least regarded with great favor, by our metropolitan churches: this the wisdom under whose guidance you, sir, may expect to be led along the "paths of peace," and under whose protection you may "lie down by the still waters," where you may expect to remain "Vicar of Bray" until you are "gathered to your fathers."

SAMUEL MAY,
FRANCIS JACKSON,
STEPHEN CHILD,
EDMUND JACKSON,
CHARLES ELLIS,
DANIEL F. CHILD,
JOHN J. MAY.

The following document we think, "relates to a recent call of a minister" and should have been published with the other documents, in conformity with the vote; as it precedes in the order of time, Mr. Fosdick's letter, and has, it will be seen, a very important bearing upon his acceptance of the call. We therefore add it here, for the purpose of correcting the *mistake*, of its omission.

